

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 10/516,332 LA-7632-101US 3041 11/30/2004 Haim Hazan EXAMINER 167 7590 08/16/2005 FULBRIGHT AND JAWORSKI LLP AMERSON, LORI BAKER 555 S. FLOWER STREET, 41ST FLOOR ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER LOS ANGELES, CA 90071 3764

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

			iala
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/516,332	HAZAN, HAIM	_
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	L Amerson	3764	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet w	vith the correspondence add	lress
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	136(a). In no event, however, may a by within the statutory minimum of thi will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO be, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this cor BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status			
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 N	lovember 2004.		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		ters, prosecution as to the	merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.I	D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.	
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or			,
Application Papers		·	
9)⊠ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 30 November 2004 is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)□ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)[drawing(s) be held in abeya tion is required if the drawing	nce. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFI	R 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. Is have been received in a rity documents have been u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National S	Stage
Attachment(s)			
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date	
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 	~~	Informal Patent Application (PTO-	·152)

Application/Control Number: 10/516,332 Page 2

Art Unit: 3764

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Objections

- 1. Claim 4 and 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.
 - a. Regarding claim 4, the phrase "dome-like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "-like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).
 - b. Regarding claim 8, the word "means" is preceded by the word(s) "height-adjusting" in an attempt to use a "means" clause to recite a claim element as a means for performing a specified function. However, since no function is specified by the word(s) preceding "means," it is impossible to determine the equivalents of the element, as required by 35 U.S.C. 112, sixth paragraph. See *Ex parte Klumb*, 159 USPQ 694 (Bd. App. 1967).
- 2. The listing of references in the specification is not a proper information disclosure statement. 37 CFR 1.98(b) requires a list of all patents, publications, or other information submitted for consideration by the Office, and MPEP § 609 A(1) states, "the list may not be incorporated into the specification but must be submitted in a separate paper." Therefore, unless the references have been cited by the examiner on form PTO-892, they have not been considered.

Application/Control Number: 10/516,332 Page 3

Art Unit: 3764

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 4. Claims 1-2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Friedman. Friedman discloses a device having a base-72, two elevated spaced-apart handles (fig. 9) supported by a structure above said base, and a spring-biased 12 pad 62 supported by said structure and being positioned between said handles to be contacted by the abdomen of an exercising user, said pad being spring-loaded upwards and moving in an angular forward-downward direction when pressed upon by the abdomen of an exercising user. The pad is pivotally supported (fig. 1).
- 5. Claims 1 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mullen. Mullen discloses a device having a base 2, two elevated spaced-apart handles 8,10 supported by a structure above said base, and a spring-biased pad 39 supported by said structure and being positioned between said handles to be contacted by the abdomen of an exercising user, said pad being spring-loaded upwards and moving in an angular forward-downward direction when pressed upon by the abdomen of an exercising user. The pad is pivotally supported (fig. 1). The structure has height adjusting means (fig. 9, 11).

Application/Control Number: 10/516,332 Page 4

Art Unit: 3764

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 7. Claims 3-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friedman as applied to claim 1 above. Friedman discloses all of the limitations of the claimed invention except the pad being pivotally supported on a circular section membe and a plurality of pads. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to mount the pad on an additional support such that the pivot movement of the pad is not obstructed by other surrounding structural elements. The Applicant should note that duplicating the components of a prior art device is a design consideration within the skill of the art. In re Harza, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).
- 8. Claims 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mullen as applied to claim 1 above and further in view of Anderson et al. Mullen teaches a plurality of springs supported by the device but does not teach a leaf spring. Anderson et al teaches a leaf spring. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to substitute a leaf spring for a tension spring such that a spring is capable of performing the function of providing resistance. The Applicant should note that duplicating the components of a prior art

Art Unit: 3764

device is a design consideration within the skill of the art. <u>In re Harza</u>, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA 1960).

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to L Amerson whose telephone number is (571) 272-4971. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri from 9-6 p.m. Interviews Tue. and Thur..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gregory Huson can be reached on 571-272-4887. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

L. Amerson